

***FINAL REPORT:***  
***OBSERVATIONS MADE AUGUST 1, 2006 AT***  
***SEDGWICK COUNTY PRIMARY ELECTION POLLING SITES***

**PRESENTED BY THE**  
***SEDGWICK COUNTY VOTER COALITION***

**Prepared and compiled by Todd Krehbiel, SCVC**

**AUGUST 14, 2006**

**The Sedgwick County Voter Coalition is a grassroots, non-partisan organization formed to ensure that the citizens of Sedgwick County know:**

When to vote  
Where to vote  
How to vote (using the new voting machines)

**To meet this objective, the mission of the SCVC is to:**

- 1) inform the public about recent dramatic changes made to the 2006 voting processes in Sedgwick County, including, but not limited to, a significant decrease in the number of polling sites, a decrease in the number of voting machines, and the introduction of new voting machines and technology;
- 2) hold elected and appointed officials accountable for providing voters timely, adequate, and accurate information about these changes, offering support when possible and appropriate to do so;
- 3) monitor the effect of these changes on the 2006 primary and general elections and urge officials by all appropriate means to immediately take any needed corrective actions;
- 4) advocate for all voters to ensure the widest voter participation, calling for openness and public discussion for any changes in voting policy and processes.

**Voting is Primary!**

**The Sedgwick County Voter Coalition is comprised of individual concerned citizens and the following organizations:**

AARP of Kansas, Wichita Chapter  
American Association of University Women, Wichita Branch  
Butler Community College Hispanic American Leadership Organization  
Church Women United  
Democratic Party of Sedgwick County  
Future Latino Leaders of Wichita, North High School  
Global Learning Center  
GOP Club of Sedgwick County  
Interfaith Ministries  
Kansas Equality Coalition, Wichita Chapter  
Kansas Hispanic/Latino Democratic Caucus  
Kansas Sunshine Coalition  
Kappa Delta Chi Service Sorority, Inc.  
Labor Council for Latin American Advancement  
League of Women Voters, Wichita-Metro  
MANA de Wichita  
NAACP  
NOW  
Peace & Social Justice Center  
Republican Women of Sedgwick County  
United States Hispanic Leadership Institute  
Urban League of Wichita  
Wichita Machinists Union

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On August 1, the Sedgwick County Voter Coalition and League of Women Voters observed roughly 30% of the county's primary election polling sites, placing special emphasis on observing polling sites assigned 4,000 or more registered voters during traditionally peak voting times: early morning, lunch, after work.

### OBSERVATIONS ABOUT THE POLLING SITES:

Observers found that 79% of polling sites used site-identifying signage near street entrances to the sites.

Overall, polling areas were secure. However, at Central Christian Church the polling site was not secure to prevent access by non-voters.

Overall, the polling sites technically complied with ADA requirements. That said, observers noted that technical compliance did not universally translate into convenience or ease of use, i.e., at several sites handicap-designated parking and entries were some distance away relative to the polling area.

Voters reported that nearly all sites were close to their homes and convenient, although voters in Clearwater complained about the distances they had to travel and another voter reported that the St. Andrew's Lutheran site was very obscure.

The polling area at the Evergreen Recreation Center was in a cramped room (about 18 ft by 20 ft) that was not air-conditioned. Instead the site was cooled by one industrial fan.

### OBSERVATIONS ABOUT THE VOTING PROCESS

At the sites observed, voters who arrived at their correct polling site experienced little difficulty and practically no delays casting their ballots—only 11% of voters interviewed after voting reported difficulties checking in and voting on the new machines. The ratio of assigned registered voters to touch-screen machines varied dramatically among the sites, but, in general, averaged 542 registered voters to every one touch-screen machine.

Aside from several notable instances of technical problems, the touch-screen machines functioned efficiently and properly and voters reported few problems using them and appreciated the ability to review and correct their ballots before submitting their vote.

Observers also noted multiple instances of voters who were uncertain how to finish and/or leaving their machines when they were done assuming that they had cast their vote when, in fact, they had not completed the process.

### OBSERVATIONS ABOUT VOTER CONFUSION

At 47% of the sites observed, we encountered voters who had come to the wrong polling location. Over the course of the day, observers directly witnessed 72 voters arriving at the wrong polling location. Once the voter's correct site appeared to be determined, the options poll workers presented "lost" voters diverged dramatically at the sites we observed:

- poll staff at some sites gave voters the option of leaving and going to their official site or casting a provisional ballot that might not have all the races specific to the voter's address
- at other sites, staff offered no provisional ballot and told voters to leave and go to their official polling site
- at still other sites, staff presented both options but did not inform voters that the provisional ballot might not have all the races specific to the voter's address

Of the 72 voters arriving at the wrong site, 47% were told to go to other sites; 53% cast provisional ballots. The inconsistencies in poll worker responses to confused voters demonstrate a clear need for training and improved procedures and tools in this area.

The failure to provide "lost" voters with complete information to permit them to make an informed choice risks disenfranchising them, either because they are frustrated at being told to go elsewhere to vote or because they are not informed of the differences in the provisional ballot from their official precinct ballot and are assured that their ballot will count.

#### OBSERVATION ABOUT POLL WORKERS

In general, observers were impressed by the hard work and dedicated efforts of poll workers to assist voters with the dramatic changes in polling sites and voting equipment. That said, observers noted areas where poll workers need further training, e.g., proper use and administration of provisional ballots and technical troubleshooting of the new machines.

#### CONCERNS ABOUT VOTER PRIVACY

At nearly all the sites we observed, the physical positioning of the voting machines was poorly planned resulting in innumerable complaints from voters about privacy. At most all the sites visited, the machines were lined up close to each other in one or two rows. The close proximity of the machines to each other allowed voters standing next to each other to easily glance over to see how the other was voting.

#### COMMENTS ON THE PRESENCE AND ASSISTANCE OF COUNTY STAFF

The coalition commends the efforts of County Manager Bill Buchanan and his staff to assist the Election Commissioner's office throughout the primary process. Our observers noted that county workers were very helpful.

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

Members of the Sedgwick County Voter Coalition (SCVC) and the League of Women Voters, Wichita-Metro (LWV) observed and conducted exit interviews of voters at 19 primary polling sites throughout Sedgwick County on August 1, 2006. The 19 sites observed have 80,822 registered voters assigned to them and account for roughly 30% of the county's polling sites after the recent consolidation by the Election Commissioner's office. SCVC placed special emphasis on observing polling sites assigned 4,000 or more registered voters during traditionally peak voting times: early morning, lunch, after work.

SCVC members designed two survey instruments to guide poll observers. One was for SCVC/LWV members to complete while observing the polls. For each polling site, the survey asked the observer to document

- the ADA-related features of the facility
- the number of machines and poll workers present
- how voters confused about their polling site were handled
- the operation of the new voting machines
- the length of time it took randomly selected voters to complete the entire voting process.

The second survey instrument was brief exit interview questionnaire designed to see if voters encountered any difficulties in knowing where to vote or how to vote using the new machines.

## **2. OBSERVATIONS ABOUT THE POLLING SITES**

### **2.1 SIGNAGE**

Observers found that 79% of polling sites used site-identifying signage near the street entrances to the sites. At one northeast Wichita site, poll workers did not have the official street entrance signs provided by the election office and so they created their own, but they proved too flimsy against the wind. There was no site-identifying signage at the street at 21% of the polling sites observed. All sites had signage at the door of the polling sites. All sites used directional arrows and posted signage on the door (including a sign banning electioneering within 250 ft of the site). Most all sites used signage mounted on a red pole that said "Vote Here" but only a couple printed the precincts served by the site in the space provided on their signs.

Observers all reported that the street signage—no larger than a typical yard sign—provided by the election office was too small, low to the ground, and not vibrant enough to command attention.

A voter who had initially gone to his old polling site to vote reported that signs had been placed on the doors of the old site directing him to sources of information (i.e., the web site address and phone number of the country election office) to consult to identify his new polling location.

### **2.2 ADA-RELATED ISSUES**

Overall, the primary polling sites technically complied with ADA requirements with each having at least 2 handicap-designated parking spaces and entry and egress either level with the parking area or accessible via ramps and curb cuts. That said, observers noted that technical ADA compliance did not universally translate into convenience or ease of use:

- At Central Christian Church, handicap parking, a curb cutout, and a ramp were all available but not convenient or in close proximity to the polling area. Only a voter acquainted with the facility would have known where to go without searching and would, even then, been required to walk some distance to enter the polling area. The parking area closest to the site's doors was not handicap designated, there was no curb cutout, and voters had to climb a significant number of stairs to enter the site. What is more, the polling site was located at the extreme South end of the huge church complex, meaning that anyone entering from the North had a long hike to get to the voting area. One observer spoke with a physically-disabled man who complained about site's lack of convenience for the disabled and the long distance he had to walk to arrive at the polling area. What is worse, after struggling to enter the site poll workers told this same individual that he was at the wrong polling site and told him to go to Eastminster Presbyterian (17th & Webb) to vote.

- The Temple Emanu-El site also had inconvenient handicap parking relative to the door. The site also required voters to take a small step to enter the site and did not have an electronic means to open the large wood door. Voters also had to make a hard turn upon entering to enter the polling area.

### **2.3 PARKING**

With the exception of the SG County Health Department Administrative Center, all sites observed had sufficient on-site parking to accommodate primary voters.

### **2.4 CONVENIENCE OF SITES**

Our exit interviews indicated that voters generally did not have to travel more than 2 miles to get to their polling site. However, voters we spoke with at both the First United Pentecostal Church (Clearwater) and First Baptist Church (2nd & Broadway) did complain about the distance they had to travel in order to vote. These same voters indicated that some of their neighbors told them that they were not going to vote on account of the distance to First Baptist.

A voter also expressed frustration with the inconvenience of the St. Andrew's Lutheran Church polling site and further commented that only voters with a car could hope to vote there. Another voter indicated that street construction made getting to the Olivet Baptist Church (W. 13th St.) polling site an obstacle course.

### **2.5 OTHER COMMENTS ON SITES OBSERVED**

The polling area at Central Christian Church was set up in a large, open space and, thus, was not secure—church staff and others not voting were able to walk through the polling area in close proximity to voters and voting machines from all directions all throughout the day.

***The polling area at the Evergreen Recreation Center was secure but it was in a cramped room (about 18 ft by 20 ft) that was not air-conditioned. Instead the site was cooled by one industrial fan.***

## **3. OBSERVATIONS ABOUT THE VOTING PROCESS**

### **3.1 GENERAL OBSERVATIONS**

At the sites observed, SCVC and LWV members found that voters who arrived at their correct polling site experienced little difficulty and practically no delays casting their ballots. Overall voters experienced no lines to either check-in or use the voting machines—only 11% of voters interviewed after voting reported difficulties checking in and voting on the new machines. Most, but not all, sites had sample paper ballots available for voters to examine before voting. While all sites had a section of the polling area designated for voters to complete paper ballots, voters were not offered a choice of voting method after they checked in. Unless the voter explicitly requested a paper ballot, poll workers escorted all voters to the new touch-screen machines. As a result, our observers all found that the new Optiscan voting system was hardly utilized.

At all sites, observers noted that after checking in poll workers escorted voters to a touch-screen machine, programmed voters' machines for the proper party and precinct, briefly explained how to operate the machine, and then generally withdrew. Poll workers were generally available to assist voters if they had further questions or needed assistance.

We also observed that the length of time taken to vote and the extent to which additional assistance was required directly correlated to voters' age and technical savvy—overall, younger, technically savvy voters spent the shortest amount time voting and required little, if any, additional assistance whereas elderly voters and those not familiar with computers required additional assistance more frequently to complete their ballots. Based on a random sampling of 93 voters, observers found that once at the machine it took primary voters, on average, 3 minutes 48 seconds to cast their votes.

### **3.2 TOUCH-SCREEN MACHINES**

Prior to the primary election, the Election Commissioner's office declined to make public its intended ratio of assigned registered voters to new voting machines. While it is important to note that the Commissioner's office did not use all the new voting machines for the primary, data collected from site observations indicate that the ratio of assigned registered voters to touch-screen machines varied

dramatically between the sites, but, in general, averaged 542 registered voters to every one touch-screen machine.

SITE	Registered Voters Assigned to Site*	Number of Touch-Screen Machines	Ratio of Assigned Voters to Machines
Bel Aire City Building	4,148	8	519:1
Central Christian Church	5,242	10	524:1
Eastminster Presbyterian	3,859	8	482:1
Evergreen Recreation Ctr	2,937	5	587:1
First Baptist Church	3,080	6	513:1
First United Pentecostal	3,772	7	539:1
Grace Presbyterian	5,777	9	642:1
Health Dept Admin Ctr	3,817	8	477:1
Maranatha Worship Ctr	4,884	10	488:1
Reformation Lutheran	5,695	8	712:1
Riverside Christian	5,238	10	524:1
St Andrew's Lutheran	4,693	8	587:1
St Elizabeth Ann Seton	4,738	8	592:1
Temple Emanu-El	NA	5	NA
West Evangelical Free	4,527	9	503:1
Westlink Christian Church	4,922	9	547:1
Westlink Church of Christ	4,686	9	521:1
Westwood Presbyterian	4,237	8	530:1
Woodlawn United Methodist (Derby)	4,570	9	508:1
		<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>542:1</b>

\* Number of assigned registered voters is from data obtained from Election Commissioner's office, June 2006.

Overall the touch-screen machines functioned efficiently and properly and voters reported few problems using them and appreciated the ability to review and correct their ballots before submitting their vote. However, at several sites observers witnessed technical problems with one or more machines. Most often reported were paper jams or running out of paper late in the day. An observer at the Maranatha Worship Center documented recurring problems throughout the day with one machine that finally forced poll workers to shut it down. A LWV member and candidate voting at his precinct polling site reported that when reviewing his ballot on the touch-screen machine he voted on, he discovered that the machine had incorrectly registered his vote in his own race for the opposing candidate. Machine errors that we witnessed or received reports on indicate a real need to mandate random audits of the new machines throughout Election Day. However, presiding judges informed observers that they had not been directed by the Election Commissioner's office to perform random audits of machines to ensure their accuracy.

Poll watchers did not observe voters verifying their ballot selections on the paper printout and poll workers did not inform voters about this feature. Observers also noted multiple instances of voters who were uncertain how to finish and/or leaving their machines when they were done assuming that they had cast their vote when, in fact, they had not completed the process. (In these instances, observers witnessed poll workers either assisting voters or completing the process for the voters who had left the site without altering their ballot selections.) There was also voter confusion as to the procedure for writing-in candidates. Finally, observers reported that the touch-screen machines ceased to operate at 7:00PM, even while voters were either in the process of or waiting to cast their ballots. At some sites, poll workers overrode the machines to permit voters to vote (or finishing voting). At other sites, voters were compelled to complete paper ballots instead.

#### 4. OBSERVATIONS ABOUT VOTER CONFUSION

At 47% of the sites observed, we encountered voters who were told by poll workers that they had come to the wrong polling location. Over the course of the day, observers directly witnessed 72 voters who arrived at the wrong polling location. The majority of these voters did not voice any frustration, but observers did note several instances of irate voters—an upset voter at Riverside Christian Church told an observer that

his polling site had changed 4 times leading up to the primary. In several cases (at Central Christian Church and the Sedgwick County Health Department Administrative Center), voters reported having been sent to multiple polling sites—as many as three others—in an effort to find their correct site.

Voters most often stated that they had either voted at the site in past elections—“This is where I’ve always voted”—or assumed that the site was correct because it was closest to their home. Voters arriving at incorrect sites also expressed frustration with the precinct map printed on page 5A of the August 1, 2006 *Wichita Eagle* stating that they came to site after analyzing the map only to find out that they were at the wrong location when they arrived.

#### **4.1 POLL WORKER RESPONSES TO CONFUSED OR “LOST” VOTERS**

Observers found that poll worker responses to confused voters were inconsistent across the polling sites observed and demonstrate a clear need for improved training, tools, and procedures in this area. Voters whose name did not appear in the registration book were most often directed to a poll worker working the area of the site for casting paper and provisional ballots<sup>1</sup>. This worker then tried to identify the voter’s correct polling site by consulting a very large, detailed precinct map—there was no uniform procedure established to call the election office or consult a computerized database. (At one polling site in Derby, an observer noted that poll workers set up an ad hoc system of calling between the three Derby sites in order to precisely direct voters to the site that had their name on the rolls.)

#### **4.2 INCONSISTENCIES WITH PROVISIONAL BALLOTS**

Once the voter’s correct site appeared to be determined, the options poll workers presented “lost” voters diverged dramatically:

- At some sites—notably two polling locations on the west side of Wichita—poll workers followed proper procedure by offering voters the option of either casting a provisional ballot or traveling to their assigned site to vote<sup>2</sup>. These workers further advised voters that casting a provisional ballot at a site other than their assigned one would likely deny them the ability to vote on races specific to their home address. Observers noted that among voters so informed some opted to vote provisionally, others chose to go to their proper site to ensure that they could vote on races specific to their address. Overall, observations at all sites revealed that 53% of the 72 voters who traveled to the wrong polling site completed provisional ballots.
- At other sites—chiefly a polling site in a large facility in northeast Wichita—poll workers informed voters of their “correct” polling place after reviewing the precinct map and then sent them off without offering them the choice of casting a provisional ballot. During nearly 3 hours of observation, one poll watcher at this site documented upwards of 20 voters who did not appear on the rolls. Of these, three-quarters were informed of their assigned site and directed to go to that site in order to vote. Overall, observations at all sites revealed that 47% of the 72 voters who traveled to the wrong polling site were directed to go elsewhere to vote.
- At still other sites—especially at another polling site in northeast Wichita—voters were not given full information to make an informed choice: Voters who were at the wrong polling site were offered a provisional ballot, but were not told that the ballot would likely not be correct for their address. What is more, poll workers at this site openly assured voters that their provisional ballot would count, even though election law only empowers the Board of County Commissioners to determine which provisional ballots are valid or not.

The SCVC is extremely concerned with the inconsistent responses by poll workers to “lost” voters, especially at the northeast Wichita polling sites we observed. The failure to provide “lost” voters with complete information to permit them to make an informed choice risks disenfranchising them, either

---

<sup>1</sup> However, an observer at a polling site in the northeast area of Wichita found that not all poll workers were responsive to voters trying to identify their proper polling site.

<sup>2</sup> “When there is any doubt about a voter’s eligibility to vote at the precinct where the voter attempts to vote, a provisional ballot should be provided, even if the voter is apparently unqualified. The facts of the matter can be investigated after election day before the county canvass.” [KSA 25-409] Source: [http://www.kssos.org/forms/elections/election\\_standards/ChapII-ElecAdmin.pdf](http://www.kssos.org/forms/elections/election_standards/ChapII-ElecAdmin.pdf) at p. 49.

because they are frustrated at being told to go elsewhere to vote or because they are not informed of the differences in the provisional ballot from their official precinct ballot and are assured that their ballot will count.

In addition to the inconsistent messages given to “lost” voters vis-à-vis provisional ballots, another error witnessed was poll staff permitting independent or non-affiliated voters to complete a change of party affiliation card, record the change in the registration book, and then allow them to vote on the new machines. According to the Sedgwick County Election Commissioner’s website, this practice is clearly prohibited: during a primary election, anyone wishing to change their party affiliation from what appears on the rolls must vote via provisional ballot<sup>3</sup>.

For most other occurrences—e.g., change of address, name change, unused mail-in ballot—observers noted that provisional ballot procedures were followed correctly.

## 5. OBSERVATION ABOUT POLL WORKERS

In general, observers were impressed by the hard work and dedicated efforts of poll workers to assist voters with the dramatic changes in polling sites and voting equipment. Data from the 19 sites observed indicates that the Election Commissioner’s office achieved a 1 to 1 ratio (or better) of poll workers to machines and an average ratio of 1 poll worker for every 454 registered voters.

While helpful, efficient, and competent, SCVC observers noted areas where poll worker training needs to improve. In addition to problems administering provisional ballots (see section 4.2), poll workers were not fully versed on the new equipment. Speaking to a county worker at Temple Emanu-El, one observer learned that one of the snafus with the new machines during advance voting involved sites powering the machines solely on their internal batteries, which resulted in their shutting down over time. Therefore at the sites the worker was monitoring, she was ensuring that all the machines were running off power drawn from the wall socket and not on battery power<sup>4</sup>. Another observer at Grace Presbyterian near closing time witnessed several poll workers trying to locate the written procedures for closing out the machines. They had to call downtown to request that a county worker bring them the directions.

In discussing her voting experience, a voter at St. Andrew’s Lutheran took great offense to a poll worker who she felt was too attentive while she was voting, especially when the worker pointed out that the voter had not voted on several judicial races. Another LWV member and candidate, whose voting machine had incorrectly registered his vote in one race, reported his surprise when a poll worker asked him to personally observe another voter voting on the same machine (the poll worker received permission from the voter) to see if there was a machine error<sup>5</sup>.

Observers at several locations also documented instances where poll staff had occasion to program a voter’s machine for the wrong political party or precinct resulting in the wrong ballot coming up. Another voter’s machine was programmed for a visually impaired ballot even though the voter was sighted. In both instances the presiding judge was able to correct the problems without further inconveniencing the voter.

Poll workers observers spoke with universally complained about the 15-hour day and poor pay. Many suggested having two shifts and increasing the pay. Taking steps like these could increase the available pool of workers and ensure less fatigued and error-prone workers.

---

<sup>3</sup> “In the following situations, a person offering to vote will complete a voter registration application, and then be given a provisional (paper) ballot instead of voting on a machine:…In primary elections, party affiliation different from that announced by the voter.” Source: <http://www.sedgwickcounty.org/elections/voting.htm#Provisional%20Voting>

<sup>4</sup> While SCVC did not have an observer at Temple Emanu-El to witness it, the Wednesday, August 2, 2006 *Wichita Eagle* (page 4A) documents the inability of the site’s poll workers to load new paper into the machines when they ran out around 6 PM resulting in a long line and delays while poll staff tried to get directions from downtown.

<sup>5</sup> The LWV member reported that he could not identify an error since the voter he observed did not vote on the race in which he had experienced problems.

## **6. CONCERNS ABOUT VOTER PRIVACY**

At nearly all the sites we observed, the physical positioning of the voting machines was poorly planned resulting in innumerable complaints from voters about privacy<sup>6</sup>. At most all the sites visited, the machines were lined up close to each other in one or two rows. The close proximity of the machines to each other allowed voters standing next to each other to easily glance over to see how the other was voting<sup>7</sup>. This daisy-chain configuration was done to permit all the machines to share power from a single wall socket. That said, each machine has multiple feet of electrical cord available but rather than space the machines out further from each other to ensure more privacy, poll workers elected to bunch the machines close together and leave the extra electrical cable wound up on the back of the machines.

In addition to the machines being too close together, at many sites the machines were arranged in two rows facing each other. As a result, one row faced the wall while the other faced the center of the polling area creating wide open space behind the voter, thereby allowing anyone to walk up from behind to see what the voter was doing. The absence of privacy due to this orientation was especially evident when observing wheelchair-bound voters using the machines. The screens on their machines were clearly visible to all—you did not even have to be close up to see how these voters were voting.

Concern over privacy led several sites to orient all their machines so that the voter's back was to a wall while they voted. However, this configuration still required people to walk behind the voter to get to other machines along the daisy-chain.

The one site we found that most fully addressed the privacy issue was Woodlawn United Methodist Church in Derby. Poll workers at this site spread the voting machines apart from each other and arranged them in a semi-circle to prevent voters from being able to see each other's screens. In addition, opaque vertical panels were placed close behind each voter to prevent their backs from being exposed while they voted.

## **7. COMMENTS ON THE PRESENCE AND ASSISTANCE OF COUNTY STAFF**

The coalition commends County Manager Bill Buchanan and Public Safety Director Bob Lamkey and their respective staffs for the assistance they provided the Election Commissioner's office throughout the primary process. Our observers noted that county workers were very helpful. At all the sites observed, county workers were either present or had been there more than once during the day to assist voters and poll workers and troubleshoot problems. Poll workers were also able to call a central number to request supplies or information they were lacking: e.g., extra signage, instructions for the machines. One observer witnessed a uniformed county employee in a county vehicle responding in a timely manner to fulfill a request for documentation and extra supplies. SCVC strongly recommends that this program continue and expand for the November general election.

---

<sup>6</sup> KSA 25-2703 requires that "County election officers shall arrange for voting places...to enable the voters to prepare their ballots, screened from observation...Each booth shall be designed so as to protect the privacy of the voter." KSA 25-1310 states that "[a] kind or make of voting machine approved by the secretary of state:... must provide for voting in absolute secrecy in voting, except as to persons entitled to assistance." KSA 25-1327 requires that "[a]ll voting machines used in any election shall be provided with a screen, hood or booth which shall conceal the voter and his action while voting."

<sup>7</sup> KSA 25-1332 requires that "[e]ach voting machine shall be placed at least three (3) feet from every wall and partition of the voting place and from any other voting machine, and at least four (4) feet from the table of the election board and other furniture."